

University Senate
April 12, 2010

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library on Monday, April 12, 2010. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:04 pm. He questioned the Sergeant-at-Arms, Michelle Sohner, and she verified that a quorum was present.

1. Minutes from February 8 and March 8 and Announcements

There were no changes made to the minutes from February 8, 2010, or to the minutes from March 8, 2010. Grossman **moved** to approve both sets of minutes as distributed, and Cheever **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair offered a variety of announcements.

- All faculty should turn in their grades no later than 72 hours after a final examination.
- There have been some difficulties with the faculty trustee election – the issues are being worked out and the voting site should be functioning as intended very soon.
- Colleges should currently be conducting elections to fill Senate seats.
- The Senate Council (SC) approved a change to the name of the Cardiovascular Research Center to the Dr. Sibu & Becky Saha Cardiovascular Research Center on its academic merits, and did so on behalf of the Senate.
- The SC approved changes to *Governing Regulations IV* (“The University Senate”), on behalf of the Senate. The changes included updating administrative titles, removing one outdated position, and adding new language reflecting new substantive change language for SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools). The major impetus was SACS’ requirements that there be explicit language about who is responsible for what type of substantive change. The new procedures require that the faculty be notified twice a year regarding the need to report any substantive changes. In addition, the SC Chair will mention substantive changes during new senator orientation.
- Regarding the February Senate action to approve a change to Graduate School calendar, Senator Grossman was correct in that the SC could have performed that action on behalf of the Senate, as an administrative change.
- Michael Kovash will serve as the Senate representative to the Online Teacher/Course Evaluation group.
- Armando Prats will serve as the Senate representative to the Work-Life Advisory Council.

- A number of senators' terms were ending and they were rotating off. The Chair asked that they stand; their service was recognized by a round of applause.

2. UK May 2010 Degree List

The Chair reported that due to the diligence of faculty senators working with colleagues, two undergraduate students were removed and one undergraduate degree was changed. The Chair noted that the Senate had asked that the Registrar present the names broken down by department, and the current degree list format reflected that organization. He said he would send a thank-you letter to acknowledge the change.

Grossman stated that on behalf of the department chair in the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, he was asking that a particular student's degree type be changed from a bachelor of science to a bachelor of arts degree. The Chair noted that the minutes would reflect that Grossman had transmitted that request.

Jones **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2010 list of candidates for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Proposed Change to Engineering Standing Requirements for Chemical Engineering

The Chair invited Professor Kim Anderson from the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering to explain the proposal. Guest Anderson said that CME 199 had been taught during the second semester of a student's first year. After about two years it was realized that the subject matter was too advanced for freshmen students. The proposal would move CME 199 to the second semester of the second year, and since Engineering Standing is determined during the second semester of the second year, it was no longer feasible to include CME 199 in the Standing requirements. There were no questions from senators.

Nadel **moved** to approve the proposed change to Engineering Standing Requirements for Chemical Engineering, effective fall 2010 and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Proposed New Dual Degree: PharmD and MS in Physician Assistant Studies

Professor Kelly Smith (PH/Pharmacy Practice and Science) explained the proposed new dual degree program for senators. Guest Smith explained that it would combine two clinical degree programs, and that admissions, progression requirements, etc. would be administered by each program. One additional year would be required for a student to complete both degree programs. There were no questions.

Hayes **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed New Dual Degree consisting of a PharmD & MS in Physician Assistant Studies, effective fall 2010 and Case **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Proposed Change to Minor in Computer Science

The Chair invited Hayes to share information about the proposal. Hayes explained that the proposal would add a minimum GPA requirement and residency requirement to the minor, as well as remove the requirement for CS 100.

The Chair commented that the Computer Science proposal, as well as the other curricular proposals on the agenda, came from the SC with a positive recommendation. There were no questions from senators.

Snow **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed change to the Minor in Computer Science, effective fall 2010 and D. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Winter Intersession Report

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen to offer the report. Mullen recalled that former associate provost Phil Kraemer offered an update for the first three years of the pilot, and that he (Mullen) was prepared to offer a report on the last three years of the Winter Intersession (WI) pilot. Mullen gave a brief presentation, and then answered questions.

7. Proposed Permanent Winter Intersession (Discussion Only - First Reading)

The Chair noted that any plan to make the WI permanent would require a first and second reading.

Grossman asked Mullen to bring back data that addresses the issue of whether there was a retention-of-knowledge problem with students taking courses during the WI, and if that affected later coursework. Mullen commented that some courses taught during WI were prerequisites for courses for the major. He looked through data from 2007, 2008 and 2009, and found that there were two students who took SOC 101 during WI and went on to take upper division classes in Sociology and received As and Bs. There was not much data about students moving into other courses, perhaps because students used WI to fulfill elective requirements.

Mullen went on to say that of the courses mentioned in his presentation, almost \$14,000 in tuition came in per course, spread across a wide variety of areas. He opined that the tuition income was not really paying for the cost of offering a WI course, but that each department had to make a decision as to whether or not a WI course was cost-effective or not.

In response to Arrington's request for data on responses from a WI course instructor's perspective, Mullen said that he did not have that information prepared, but was willing to try to poll a substantial group of WI instructors for that information. Arrington explained that he taught a 400-level WI course, and that many of the students enrolled were there to graduate without having to take a spring semester course. He wondered aloud if what he taught was sufficient for post-graduation retention.

Yanarella said that he was a big supporter of WI when it was first vetted in the SC, thinking it could be great for experimental courses and study abroad, although it seems to have found its own niche. He asked if Mullen or someone in his area to create a recruitment strategy for both increased numbers of students as well as increased course diversity. Mullen replied that it was best to be intentional about how courses are brought into the WI, and that colleges should have a thoughtful discussion about what are its strategic courses. If WI can satisfy a student's learning and allows a student the opportunity to stay on track to graduate, it was worth taking up such discussions as mentioned by Yanarella.

Connors asked about how Mullen planned to grow the number of WI courses to something more substantial. Mullen replied that he would need a marketing campaign to help support an expansion of WI. Prats commented that he taught a WI once, and it was so exhausting he was unlikely to do it again. He said that the pay rates for instructors changes at the college level, so it might be beneficial to see if

compensation affects how many courses are taught. Mullen said that it was his understanding that colleges have different compensation levels.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate receive the Winter Intersession Report and Steiner **seconded**.

Jensen asked about pay rates for instructors, saying that there has been a fair amount of conversation regarding summer school pay rates and faculty salaries. She stated that the issue of faculty compensation should be clear if a proposal to make WI permanent is discussed.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair asked if there were any other questions for Mullen, and Kwon asked if the advantages to the University could be articulated in the proposal for permanency. Mullen replied that if a handful of students take a three-credit hour course and they graduate sooner into the six-year window given for graduation, then it improves UK's six-year graduation rates. In addition, the total income from WI tuition on average exceeded the teacher cost.

8. Code of Student Conduct (for Endorsement)

Assistant Provost for Program Support Richard Greissman explained to senators about the proposed changes to the Code of Student Conduct. Guest Greissman began by saying that the Code of Student Conduct (Code) had been last updated in 2005, and there was an effort to regularly review the Code, as opposed to updating it every 25 years or so. Due to changes in federal legislation and Title IX changes, as well as changes to UK policies, updates to various pieces of language were needed. The changes also clarify the judicial procedures associated with alleged violations of the Code, particularly those pertaining to criminal acts and alerting students.

After additional introductory comments by Greissman, he noted that he was asking for Senate endorsement and that the proposal would go to the Student Government Association (SGA) in two days for that body's review. After SGA review, the proposed changes will go to the Board of Trustees (BoT) with, hopefully, an effective date of July 1.

Nadel commented that suggestions by senators would affect the students' deliberations, and Greissman replied that the Code was deliberately brought to the Senate first to ensure that students were apprised of faculty input.

Snow asked if there had been any input from students. Greissman said that beyond the input of the SGA, he was unable to comment on additional student input.

Nokes **moved** that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to the Code of Student Conduct and Snow **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

9. Quality Enhancement Plan Update

Senator Diane Snow offered a presentation to senators. After the presentation, both she and Professor Diane Sellnow answered questions from senators.

Steiner asked if there were examples of what other institutions had done, and Guest Sellnow suggested he visit the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) site, where there examples from other universities.

Kwon asked how faculty could see the other ideas that are being developed, and Snow said that it was decided at the last QEP meeting to put the ideas online. Grossman asked about the possibility of developing a wiki or online community to share ideas, and Sellnow replied that there was someone in Public Relations working on a Facebook site, and that Sellnow would check into Grossman's suggestion.

In response to a question from Mountford about the rubrics for the QEP, Sellnow replied that rubrics will be developed based on criteria from SACS, and collecting ideas for rubrics will be part of summer activities. Sellnow added that she and Snow would return to the Senate in September with additional information. There were no further questions from senators.

10. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations* (for Endorsement): *AR 3:4* ("Out-Of-State Employment or Assignment of Faculty and Staff"); *AR 4:7* ("Student Financial Aid Appeals and Advisory Committee"); and *AR 10:2* ("Information Technology Advisory Committees")

The Chair invited guest Associate General Counsel Marcy Deaton to explain the changes to each of the regulations.

Regarding *AR 3:4* ("Out-Of-State Employment or Assignment of Faculty and Staff"), Guest Deaton explained that there were no substantive changes. The revisions establish policies for out-of state programs, and define benefit and salary adjustments. In addition, the formatting was updated and out of date references to titles and other ARs were modified.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 3:4* and Nadel **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Deaton went on to explain the changes to *AR 4:7* ("Student Financial Aid Appeals & Advisory Committee"). She said the regulation was renamed, and establishes appeals processes for students and student athletes. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) requires that there be an independent committee to which students appeal. Such a committee has functioned for some time, but their activities were not well described by regulation. The changes are not substantive, but rather clarify practices, and were requested by individuals in Athletics and Associate Provost for Enrollment Management Don Witt.

D. Anderson **moved** that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:7* and Meyer **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The last regulation was *AR 10:2* ("Information Technology Advisory Committees"). Deaton explained that the Information Technology Advisory Committees had undergone a restructuring, into three components: an umbrella committee that consists of a majority of faculty and reports jointly to the Provost and the Chief Information Officer; and two subordinate committees, the Academic Computing Committee and the Administrative Systems Committee. The aim of the restructuring was to allow for greater faculty input and involvement in the computing committees.

In response to Grossman, Deaton replied that the President appoints the committee members. Provost Subbaswamy added that those appointments were made via recommendations from the SC. Kightlinger referred to a mention of a graduate student member, and asked if that included professional students. Deaton replied that she was unsure, but would take that comment back for consideration. Grossman **moved** that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 10:2*, and Mountford **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

11. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 2:9* ("Lecturer Title Series")

Greissman explained that *AR 2:9* was last changed in 2005. The current revisions began as an initiative from the College of Arts and Sciences to bring a greater professional posture to the lecturer series faculty. The salient changes, aside from clarification, involve the terms of contract - introducing the concept of a rolling contract and professional development opportunities. The proposed appointment period was originally proposed to be for two years, but faculty feedback showed a preference for four to six years, so four years for an initial appointment period was decided upon. The rolling contract for senior lecturers was originally planned to be for four years, but was reduced to three years over concerns that four years was too long. The lecturer rank has a two-year rolling contract. Lecturers will be reviewed annually, and senior lecturers will be reviewed biennially. As a quasi-sabbatical opportunity, there is new language about a one-time course reduction per six years, for a one-year period of a two course reduction.

In response to Grossman, Greissman explained that as the two-year rolling lecturer contract comes up, it is renewed for two more years. If someone has unsatisfactory progress, the lecturer is given one year for improvement. A senior lecturer with an unsatisfactory performance will have a three-year window. If a lecturer continues to perform unsatisfactorily, they will be taken off the rolling contract and there will be three possible outcomes – termination at the end of the contract, renewal of a non-rolling contract due to insufficient progress, or a return to rolling contracts because the person is back on track and performing.

L. Meyer asked about the Provost making final decisions on lecturers without the benefit of an area committee's input. Greissman replied that the regular activities of promotion and tenure of the area committees are quite a bit different from the review of lecturers. Jones added that when the rank of senior lecturer was created in 2005, area committee chairs were canvassed for their collective opinion about reviewing lecturer faculty. Those chairs at that time did not think area committees were an appropriate mechanism to review lecturers. Area committee chairs' opinions were re-solicited for this *AR* revision and a majority of the chairs responding felt the same way.

Greissman said that the review would go through a process at the college level. Because the dean makes a recommendation to the Provost, the review goes from the educational unit to the college, and the dean can ask the college's advisory committee to weigh in. The only circumvention, per se, is that of the area committees. Noting Meyer's concern about clarity, Greissman said he would review the language to ensure that there could be no misinterpretation.

Yanarella recalled to Greissman that when the revisions were discussed at the SC, Greissman advised him to bring up to the Senate two issues raised during that meeting: grandfathering existing lecturers, many of whom have given loyal and dedicated service for years who are anxious about qualifications written into the *ARs* and a concern about the percentage of lecturers in some academic units and the generality of that language. Provost Subbaswamy acknowledged that whenever changes are made, there is always an issue of the extent to which incumbents are affected. In this instance, the requirement that gets in the way of grandfathering is that of an expectation of a terminal degree. There will be exceptions for those fields where a terminal degree is not appropriate or feasible, but over a period of time it is reasonable to expect that terminal degree holders will bring a good cadre of pedagogical input. To simply say that everyone would be grandfathered in could create a two-class system. As opposed to the Provost making all such decisions, he said that there should be a fair system recommended by the faculty of each college and implemented by the college.

Greissman commented that language pertaining to an educational unit has been tightened, and that units are where the academic appointments will occur, as well as where decisions on percentages will be determined. When the 2005 revisions were proposed, there were specific percentages of lecturers written into the language and subsequently removed after Senate input – the Senate said that faculties and departments have enough at stake to know what is best for their respective areas.

In response to a question from Wasilkowski, Greissman replied that suggestions from the College of Engineering to have a one-year contract following a bad review instead of two years were what caused the language to be changed to one year. Mountford asked about maximum percentages for units and Greissman explained that the requirement was that if a unit does want to impose a percentage, it must be codified. Jones said that he interpreted that language to mean that if a unit chooses to hire lecturers, then such a decision must be made. He noted that some departments with lecturers still had not developed criteria by which lecturers are evaluated. H. Anderson (associate provost for faculty affairs) said that after the changes to *AR 2:9* are made effective, she will review units to see if lecturer information in the college and/or department rules are up to date, and will ask them to update them if not. There will a rubric available, similar to that used for department and college rules.

Wasilkowski **moved** that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 2:9* and Grossman **seconded**. Meyer asked about language to clarify the proposals, and Greissman noted that the *GR/AR* workgroup will meet in the next couple of days, and will discuss it then. He reminded senators that both the Chair and Kaveh Tagavi are members of the group, and will help make sure that those changes will be made.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

12. Update on Transfer Action Plan Legislation – Provost Kumble Subbaswamy

Provost Subbaswamy offered a presentation on Transfer Action Plan legislation occurring in Frankfurt. As he finished the presentation, the Provost noted that in response to SACS (Southern Association for the Accreditation of Colleges and Schools) many public institutions are working on assessment and the learning cycle. All of Kentucky's four-year public institutions are aligned with the AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities) model, and are surprisingly aligned amongst the four-year institutions. KCTCS can make a single alignment with the four-year institutions, which will work better. There were still details to be worked out, though, although there was a good understanding in the General Assembly about what the legislation entails.

Grossman said that one of the most consistent transfer problems pertained to transferring labs that differ in the number of lab hours. For example, a recurring question pertains to whether or not taking one hour of this lab and one hour of that lab through KCTCS counts as two lab hours at UK. Provost Subbaswamy said that there was no explicit discussion of labs, and that when faculty committees assemble to talk about this, it will need to be discussed. It is expected that there could be a statewide equivalency test, and it might be worth talking about a competency test for standardization.

Steiner thanked the Provost, saying that he worked decisively and quickly with the legislation, and that he did a wonderful job.

13. Reminder on Submitting New Business

The Chair reminded senators about the procedures for bringing new business to the Senate. He gave senators a moment to read pertinent language from the *Senate Rules*, displayed via the PowerPoint presentation:

...The Senate Council shall prepare agendas for regular Senate meetings. Any student, faculty member or administrator may present a written recommendation for Senate action to the Senate Council. The Senate Council may refer it to committee or act on it itself. If referred to committee, the committee shall approve, disapprove, or modify the recommendation. The original recommendation with committee action shall be forwarded to the Senate Council. The recommendation shall be placed on the Senate agenda unless both the committee and the Senate Council determine otherwise. If the Senate Council acts on the recommendation without sending it to committee, it can decide not to place the matter on the agenda....

...In this situation, the recommendation may be introduced on the Senate floor if its initiator obtains either the signature of ten (10) Senators, or a petition approved by a corresponding percentage of the members of the University Faculty in the case of matters for which the elected University Faculty Senators are responsible. The agenda plus all recommendations for Senate action shall be posted on the University Senate's Web site and circulated by e-mail to all members of the University Senate and to administrative offices that are concerned with academic affairs at least six (6) days prior to regular Senate meetings....

The Chair shared that the SC was trying to conduct business a little differently and will continue to do so. There will likely be two SC retreats this summer, with both focused on how to better conduct Senate-related business.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 4:43 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; Almasi*; Arents; Arnold; Atwood; Back; Birdwhistell; Bishop*; Blackwell; Boissonneault; Brennen; Chappell*; Costich*; Coyne; Culver; Denison; Dyer; Edgerton; Estus; Etensohn; Gesund*; Gonzalez*; J. Hall; Hallman; Hardesty; T. Harris; V. Hazard*; Heller; J. Jackson; Januzzi; Karan; Kidwell; Kington; Kirk; Kirschling; Lester; Maglinger; Martin*; McCormick*; McCorvey; McMahan; Mehra; Mendiondo; Mobley; Murphy; Nardolillo; Nieman; D. O'Hair; M. O'Hair; Patsalides; Perman; Perry; Ray; Reed; Richey; Rieske-Kinney; Ritchie; Robinson; Rohr*; Roorda; Rouse; Santhanam*; Schoenberg; Sellnow; Shannon; Shay; M.S. Smith*; R. Smith; Speaks; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Sutphen; Swanson*; Telling; Thacker; Todd; Tracy; Travis; Troske; Turner; D. Watt*; Wells; Wermeling*; Wiseman; D. Witt; Zhang.

Invited guests present: Kim Anderson, Richard Greissman and Kelly Smith.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on September 7, 2010.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.